

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised by yesterday's nerve agent incident in Tokyo. Now I am concerned about what might happen here in the United States.

Let me read, Mr. Speaker, from a special inquiry which I chaired in 1993 dealing with the growing threat of chemical and biological weapons. One of our conclusions was,

The prospects for chemical and biological terrorism have probably increased as terrorists and sponsors of terrorism acquire chemical and biological warfare agents and weapons. As a consequence, the possibility of terrorist use of such agents against the United States or one of its allies cannot be discounted and should not be ignored. The United States should strengthen emergency planning to respond to a potential terrorist use of chemical or biological weapons.

Well-trained and equipped military personnel can survive and fight a chemical war, but civilians cannot deal with chemical attack. Chemical weapons have been called the poor man's atom bomb because they are cheap and easy to make and because civilians are thoroughly panicked by chemical weapons.

Look at today's headlines.

The Washington Post, "Nations Unready To Thwart Mass Poisoning."

The Washington Times, "Subway Gassing Called a Preview of Terrorist Future."

USA Today, "Transit System Alert Urged. Officials Fear Copycat of Japanese Gas Attack."

The New York Daily News says, "New York's Subway Riders' Nightmare. We Have No Plan."

Mr. Speaker, it is only a matter of time before terrorists, extortionists or deranged individuals and groups targeted Americans. That is why I am asking American defense intelligence and emergency preparedness officials to tell me and the American people just what our Government is doing to prepare for chemical and biological terrorism here in the United States.

TAX RELIEF AND REDUCED SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that just spoke is quite right, and I think looking at old George Washington over there, he would have agreed that defending the country is primary in our interest. I think old George would also have agreed that we don't need welfare, and we don't need high taxes. In his day, there wasn't any income tax.

I stand here to tell you that a promise we made to the seniors that we would give them tax relief by eliminating the 85-percent tax on Social Security is in jeopardy. A promise we made to married couples that they would get relief from the marriage penalty is in jeopardy. A promise we made to give

the people the option of using their IRA's to buy their first home, send their kids to college or help pay their medical bills is in jeopardy. And a promise to families to provide them with a \$500 per child tax credit is in jeopardy.

Why? Because some of your Congressmen on both sides of the aisle want to lower the income level from \$200,000 down to \$95,000. It disappoints me that we have to have an income gap, but it irritates me that some Members want to lower it. Every single American deserves tax relief and it is preposterous that even the Members who signed the Contract With America are now reneging on the promise they made to the American people.

Believe me, I have heard the arguments. "Tax cuts are for the rich. They will increase the Federal deficit." Those are false statements. They really are. Those arguments are shortsighted and they have no concern for our current tax burden that is placed on every American taxpayer.

Did you know that in 1950, the typical American family with two children sent \$1 out of every \$50 it earned to Washington, DC? Last year, just 25 years later, that same family sent \$1 out of every 48 it earned to Washington, DC.

A family with five children making \$200,000 a year is not rich. Besides, whose money is it, anyway? We are not taking it back from the Federal Government. We are giving it back to the people who earned it, you the voters, the constituency, the people of America.

The Government did not work to earn the money but I will bet you for sure the Government sure knows how to waste it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose these questions to the American people. Are you taxed too heavily? Do you deserve tax relief? Do you believe the Government spends too much? Finally, do you believe that Republicans should keep our promises?

I urge each of you to call your representatives and let me know you support this bill. Pick up the phone right now and make your Congressman accountable. Tax relief combined with spending reductions will revive America's strength.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we had a member from the majority side a few minutes ago talking about joining the debate on welfare reform. I would be more than happy to join the debate with him, talking about the fallacies of both the original H.R. 4 that was introduced but also the H.R. 1214 that we are considering today and this week and which reminds me, since

last year I heard from so many talk show folks about, I wonder how many of those people have read H.R. 1214 who are now talking about it as the greatest thing since sliced bread?

It is not as big as some of the bills we have considered but it is almost 400 pages and I hope that some of the proponents who talk about how great it is have had a chance to read it, like some of us have who were on the committees who dealt with it.

The school nutrition program will be hurt if we pass the, what is now H.R. 1214. The Republicans' shell game continues with our children hanging in the balance. As this flier states, "When It's Budget Cutting Time, You Always Shoot at the Easiest Target." You can see how the impact of that will be when you talk about the WIC program, or you talk about the children's nutrition program.

Your argument should be that we do need to reform welfare, and I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but this bill that came out of both the Committee on Ways and Means and out of the committee I serve on was not a debate, it was just, "We have a plan and we are going to run over you as Democrats. We're not going to agree with you that we need to address children's nutrition through the School Lunch Program. We're just going to block-grant it. We're going to do what we want to do."

So there was not a debate. It was the majority saying we are going to do it the way that we want instead of really making it a bipartisan effort.

When I came to Congress in January, I thought that welfare reform would be a bipartisan effort, but I do not think we are going to see it today or this week because it has not been.

I agree we need to reform welfare. We need to take away the incentive of someone or the tragedy of a person being on welfare. But we do not need to cut the programs that provide the most effective safety net that we have for our children. We should require people to work. We should require a time limit about how long they are on there. We should require them to go to job training. We should require them to do all sorts of things. But when you take the school nutrition program and you say we are going to increase the authorization, whereas now a child shows up in school, they have a guarantee of that lunch if they are qualified and say we are going to authorize 4 percent more but next year in the Committee on Appropriations it may be cut and then we are going to let the State take 20 percent and spend it on something else because of the block granting. That is why this poster is so relevant: "When it's budget cutting time, the easiest target is a child."

Last week a colleague of mine from Texas talked about some of the highway demonstration projects in the rescission bill that were untouched. Yet we cut AmeriCorps, we cut job training, and most of these projects were